

Application Number 10/783,999
Response to Office Action mailed March 6, 2008

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated March 6, 2008. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the continued attention to the current application. Claims 1 - 16 were previously examined. Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 12 to more clearly describe the claimed subject matter. Applicant has amended dependent claims 3, 9, 11 and 12 for consistency with the amended claims. New claims 21 to 25 have been added. The claim amendments are fully supported by the application as originally filed, and in particular at page 4 lines 10 - 13, and claims 2, 6 and 7 as originally filed.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 - 11 under 35 U.S.C. 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner alleged that the claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or manufacture. The Examiner has interpreted "a computer-implemented system" as a computer program product. Applicant submits that one skilled in the art would readily understand that a computer-implemented system is not the same as a computer program product. Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to clarify that the computer-implemented system comprises a processor for executing instructions, and a memory operatively coupled to the processor for storing the instructions.

Applicant trusts that the Examiner agrees the amended claim is directed towards statutory subject matter and complies with 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 - 6, 9 and 11 - 13 under 35 USC § 102(e) for allegedly being anticipated by Yeh (US 6,980,980). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection in view of the claim amendments and following arguments.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner has equated the summary cube of Yeh with the control cube of the present application, and the detail cubes of Yeh with the member cubes of the present application. Applicant respectfully submit that the summary cube of Yeh, which stores summary information and retrieves the stored summary information, cannot be equated with the control cube of the present application which access the member cubes. Furthermore the detail cubes of Yeh, which are intended to be partitioned along multiple dimensions cannot be equated

Application Number 10/783,999
Response to Office Action mailed March 6, 2008

with the member cubes of the present application, which are partitioned along a single partitioning dimension.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant has amended the independent claim to clarify that the system comprises one or more member cubes for storing data partitioned along a single partitioning dimension, and a control cube for accessing the member cubes that includes metadata about the member cubes. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim is not anticipated by Yeh.

The control cube as currently claimed is for accessing the member cubes. By contrast, Yeh teaches the use of a summary cube and one or more detail cubes. The summary cube of Yeh is not for accessing the detail cubes, but rather for retrieving summary information stored in the summary cube itself. The summary cubes are similar to the detail cubes, in that they store data along various dimensions. The summary cubes have the identical dimensions as the detail cubes. This allows for the seamless navigation from the summary cube to the detail cube. Since both cubes have the same dimensions, the drilling through (or zoom in) from the summary cube to the detail cube can use the same selections and filters. As taught by Yeh, a summary cube is accessed using a particular set of selections and filters, to retrieve summary information. That is the summary information stored in the summary cube is retrieved from the summary cube. The summary information can be zoomed in on. If the information is zoomed in to the point where the information is no longer stored in the summary cube, the detail information can be retrieved from the detail cube using the same set of selections and filters.

Yeh teaches splitting information into summary information stored in a summary cube and detail information stored in a detail cube. By partitioning the information to have identical dimensions, information (either summary or detail) can be retrieved from either cube using the same set of selections and filters. Applicant submits that this does not teach nor suggest a control cube for accessing the member cubes, in which the control cube provides an access point for accessing information stored in various member cubes.

Furthermore, Yeh requires a partitioning of the original cube that differs from the partitioning taught by the current application. The partitioning taught by Yeh splits a cube into summary information and detail information. The summary information is stored in and retrieved from the summary cube. The detail information is stored in and retrieved from a detail

Application Number 10/783,999
Response to Office Action mailed March 6, 2008

cube. The detail information may further be partitioned to provide separate subsets of detailed information. Each subset of detail information is stored in and retrieved from a detail cube. This partitioning is in contrast to the current partitioning in which the member cubes are portioned along a partitioning dimension and retain all of the detail information.

Furthermore Yeh fails to teach or suggest that a control cube includes metadata about the member cubes. As set forth above, Yeh accesses the information stored in the cubes directly, whether the cubes are a summary cube or a detail cube. As such the summary cube does not need to include metadata about the detail cubes. Since both the summary and detail cubes of Yeh have the same dimensions, the navigator taught by Yeh can access either cube using the same selections and filters. This does not suggest including metadata in a control cube as information is retrieved from both cubes of Yeh directly.

In addition to Yeh failing to teach or suggest all of the limitations of the current claims, Applicants further note that a system according to the teachings of Yeh would not be able to provide the same results as a system according to the current claims. Since the Summary cube of Yeh is not used for accessing the information stored in the detail cubes, but rather for storing summary information, it is not possible to use the summary cube of Yeh to access information stored in different detail cubes. As such the system of Yeh cannot be used to extract detail information from across multiple detail cubes. By contrast, the control cube as currently claimed, can access information stored in multiple member cubes using the information describing how each of the member cubes are partitioned along the single partitioning dimension.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Yeh, and so complies with 35 U.S.C. 102.

Regarding independent claim 12, Applicant has amended the independent claims in accordance with the amendments made to independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Yeh fails to teach or suggest portioning the data along a single partitioning dimension. Yeh further fails to teach or suggest creating a control cube having metadata about the member cubes. Yeh also fails to teach or suggest accessing the data distributed over the member cubes through the control cube.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 12 is not anticipated by Yeh, and so complies with 35 U.S.C. 102.

Application Number 10/783,999
Response to Office Action mailed March 6, 2008

Regarding dependent claims 2 - 6, 9, 11 and 13, Applicant respectfully submit that Yeh fails to teach all of the limitations of the independent claims, as set forth above. As such Yeh also fails to teach all of the limitations of the dependent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 2 - 6, 9, 11 and 13 are not anticipated by Yeh, and so comply with 35 U.S.C. 102.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 7 and 14 - 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yeh in view of Mundy ("Using Partitions in a Microsoft SQL Server 2000 Data Warehouse", February 2000). Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Mundy fail to provide any information that overcomes the deficiencies of Yeh as set forth above. Applicant submits that one skilled in the art would not be led to the subject matter of claims 7 and 14 - 16 having regard to the teachings of Yeh and Mundy. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 7 and 14 - 16 comprise patentable subject matter and comply with 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yeh in view of Pasumansky et al. (US Patent 6,477,536). Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Pasumansky fail to provide any information that overcome the deficiencies of Yeh as set forth above. Applicant submits that one skilled in the art would not be led to the subject matter of claims 5 and 10 having regard to the teachings of Yeh and Pasumansky. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 5 and 10 comprise patentable subject matter and comply with 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that current claims comprise subject matter that is not taught or suggested by Yeh, Mundy or Pasumansky taken alone or in combination. Applicant further submits that none of the references contain any suggestion of modifying their teachings to arrive at the currently claimed subject matter. As such Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 - 16 and 21 - 25 comply with 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103.

Application Number 10/783,999
Response to Office Action mailed March 6, 2008

CONCLUSION

All claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 50-1778. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Date:

By:

June 6, 2008

SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.
1625 Radio Drive, Suite 300
Woodbury, Minnesota 55125
Telephone: 651.286.8341
Facsimile: 651.735.1102

Kent J. Sieffert

Name: Kent J. Sieffert
Reg. No.: 41,312